UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/748,623	12/22/2000	Richard A. Keeney	EFIM1174	4584

31408 7590 11/20/2006

LAW OFFICE OF JAMES TROSINO
92 NATOMA STREET, SUITE 211
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105

EXAMINER	
SHAPIRO, LEONID	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2629	

DATE MAILED: 11/20/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/748,623	KEENEY ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Leonid Shapiro	2629	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *08 September 2006*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,4-6,11-13,15,18-20,25-27 and 29-32* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,4-6,11-13,15,18-20,25-27,29-32* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1, 11-13, 15, 25-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kurogane (US Patent No. 6,259.424 B1) in view of Krusius et al. (US Patent No. 6,005,649).

As to claim 1, Kurogane teaches a method for mitigating defects caused by inoperative pixels in liquid crystal display built on a silicon integrated circuit substrate (See Col. 5, Lines 3-34), the substrate having an integral metal-oxide semiconductor (MOS) control chip (See Col. 8, Lines 11-15) containing MOS drive circuitry (See Fig. 1, items 1A, 1B, 10, Col. 6, Lines 41-45, from Col. 1, Line 65 to Col. 7, Line 2), the drive circuitry comprising a plurality of pixel drive circuits, each pixel drive circuit coupled to a corresponding pixel (See Fig. 7, items 7A-7B,2A-2B, Col. 9, Lines 52-64), the method comprising:

identifying a defective pixel drive circuit coupled to an inoperative pixel (See Fig. 4, items 21A, 22, Col. 8, Lines 16-38);

disconnecting the defective drive circuitry from inoperative pixel (See Fig.7, items 1A, 33, Col. 9, Lines 51-57).

connecting the inoperative pixel to a working pixel drive circuit coupled to a nearby pixel such that the detective pixel drive circuit is by passed and inoperative pixel is driven from the working pixel drive circuit of the nearby circuit, the nearby pixel comprising one of adjacent pixel (See Fig. 7, items 7A-7B,2A-2B, Col. 9, Lines 52-64).

Kurogane does not show micro-display and CMOS control chip and CMOS drive circuitry.

Krusius et al. teaches the back plane of a typical micro-display is formed from a crystalline silicon chip includes CMOS integrated circuits (See Col. 2, Lines 1-4) and CMOS driver circuit (See Col. 2, Lines 27-30).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use micro-display and CMOS integrated circuits using typical SRAM process as shown by Krusius et al. in the Kurogane system for repairing MOS panels in order to reduce size of display to 10X7 mm (See Col. 1, Lines 31-35).

As to claim 15, Kurogane teaches mitigating defects caused by inoperative pixels in liquid crystal display, comprising:

a plurality of pixels (See Fig. 17, item 2, Col. 2, Lines 1-13);

an integral metal-oxide semiconductor (MOS) control chip (See Col. 8, Lines 11-15) comprising a plurality of pixel drive circuits, each pixel drive circuit coupled to a corresponding pixel (See Fig. 7, items 7A-7B,2A-2B, Col. 9, Lines 52-64),

means for disconnecting the defective drive circuitry from inoperative pixel (See Fig.7, items 1A, 33, Col. 9, Lines 51-57).

means for connecting the inoperative pixel to a working pixel drive circuit coupled to a nearby pixel such that the detective pixel drive circuit is by passed and inoperative pixel is driven from the working pixel drive circuit of the nearby circuit, the nearby pixel comprising one of adjacent pixel (See Fig. 7, items 7A-7B,2A-2B, Col. 9, Lines 52-64).

Kurogane does not show micro-display and CMOS control chip and CMOS drive circuitry.

Krusius et al. teaches the back plane of a typical micro-display is formed from a crystalline silicon chip includes CMOS integrated circuits (See Col. 2, Lines 1-4) and CMOS driver circuit (See Col. 2, Lines 27-30).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use micro-display and CMOS integrated circuits using typical SRAM process as shown by Krusius et al. in the Kurogane system for repairing MOS panels in order to reduce size of display to 10X7 mm (See Col. 1, Lines 31-35).

As to claims 11, 25, Kurogane teaches pixels repaired in groups (See Fig. 10A, 10B, items yi and yi+1, in description See Col. 10, Lines 52-58).

As to claims 12, 26, Kurogane teaches identifying defective drive circuitry comprises the further step of providing test circuitry associated with the display (See Fig. 4, items 21A, 22, Col. 8, Lines 16-38).

As to claims 13, 27, Kurogane teaches pixel drive circuitry associated with each pixel is located separately from each pixel (See Fig. 4, items 1A,3A,1B,3B, in description See Col. 7, Lines 1-33).

2. Claims 29-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krusius et al., Kurogane as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Hiroki (US Patent No. 6, 618, 115 B1).

Krusius et al., Kurogane do not show defective CMOS drive circuitry is identified after the CMOS control chip and the liquid crystal material assembled together via optical inspection of the display after assembly of display.

Hiroki teaches defective CMOS drive circuitry is identified after the CMOS control chip and the liquid crystal material assembled together via optical inspection of the display after assembly of display (See Figs 5-6, items 301-307, in description See Col. 6, Lines 16-28 and 51-67, Col. 10, Lines 4-8).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to identify defective CMOS drive circuitry after the CMOS control chip and the liquid crystal material assembled together via optical inspection of the display after assembly of display as shown by Hiroki in Krusius et al., Kurogane apparatus and method in order to repair panels having sufficiently few defects.

3. Claims 4, 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krusius et al., Kurogane as aforementioned in claims 1 and 15 in view of Yamazaki et al. (US Patent No. 6, 147, 667).

Krusius et al., Kurogane do not show additional circuitry with a bypass bit latch, such when bypass bit latch is set from an external memory, the detective drive circuitry

is bypassed and the inoperative pixel is driven from the working drive circuit of the nearby pixel.

Yamazaki et al. teaches the latch circuit controlled the bit signals (See Fig. 12B and 12C, items 63-71, in description See Col. 24, Lines 1-7).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use bit latch as shown by Yamazaki et al. in the Krusius et al., Kurogane apparatus and method in order to repair panels having sufficiently few defects.

4. Claims 5, 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krusius et al., Kurogane as aforementioned in claims 1 and 15 in view of Yang (US Patent No. 6,392,427 B1).

Krusius et al., Kurogane do not show multiplexing the drive circuits of each pixel with the drive circuit of a nearby pixel.

Yang teaches multiplexer and drive array to route test patterns (See Fig 4, items 400, 406, 408, in description see Col. 4, lines 55-59).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use multiplexer as shown by Yang in the Krusius et al., Kurogane apparatus and method in order to repair panels having sufficiently few defects.

5. Claims 6, 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krusius et al., Kurogane as aforementioned in claims 1 and 15 in view of Anholm et al. (US Patent No. 5,043,655).

Krusius et al., Kurogane do not show tri-state transistor associated with each pixel connected to the bypass latch and resistor coupling neighboring pixels, such that when the bypass bit is set, the transistor is switched to bypass the detective drive circuitry so that the inoperative pixel is driven from the working drive circuit of a nearby pixel through resistor.

Kurogane teaches to connect nearby pixel (See Fig. 7, items 2A,2B,33).

Anholm et al. teaches tri-state control (See Fig. 4, items 50-56, in description see Col. 7, Lines 29-45).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a tri-state transistor with bypass latch and resistor as shown by Anholm et al. in Krusius et al., Kurogane apparatus and method in order to repair panels having sufficiently few defects.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1,4-6,11-13,15,18-20,25-27,29-32 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

7. Applicant's arguments filed 09/08/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive:

On page 8, 3rd paragraph of Remarks, Applicant's stated that Kurogane does not describe or suggest methods or apparatus that identify a defective pixel drive circuit coupled to an inoperative pixel. However, Kurogane teaches identifying a defective

pixel drive circuit coupled to an inoperative pixel (See Fig. 4, items 21A, 22, Col. 8, Lines 16-38).

On same page, the same paragraph of Remarks, Applicant's stated that Kurogane identifies defective transistors before they are ever coupled to their corresponding pixel electrodes, and then modifies the manufacturing process to make sure the defective transistors are never coupled to the corresponding pixel electrode. However, this limitation nowhere in claims. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (identifies defective transistors before they are ever coupled to their corresponding pixel electrodes, and then modifies the manufacturing process to make sure the defective transistors are never coupled to the corresponding pixel electrode) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

On same page, the same paragraph of Remarks, Applicant's stated that Kurogane never describes disconnecting a defective pixel drive circuit from the inoperative pixel. Indeed, because the defective transistor was never connected in the firs place, there is nothing to disconnect. Further, as previously mentioned, Kurogane does not describe or suggest connecting an inoperative pixel to a working drive circuit of a nearby pixel that may be an adjacent pixel or a non-adjacent pixel. However, Kurogane teaches how to disconnect a defective pixel drive circuit from the inoperative

pixel and connect to pixel to a working drive circuit of a nearby pixel (See Fig. 7, items 7A-7B,2A-2B, Col. 9, Lines 52-64).

Telephone inquire

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Leonid Shapiro whose telephone number is 571-272-7683. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 a.m. to 5 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard Hjerpe can be reached on 571-272-7691. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

LS
11.12.06

RICHARD HJERPE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600